Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

The analysis of FETI-DP preconditioner for full DG discretization of elliptic problems

Maksymilian Dryja · Juan Galvis · Marcus Sarkis

arXiv:1401.0961v1 [math.NA] 6 Jan 2014

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper a discretization based on discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method for an elliptic two-dimensional problem with discontinuous coefficients is considered. The problem is posed on a polygonal region Ω which is a union of N disjoint polygonal subdomains Ω_i of diameter $O(H_i)$. The discontinuities of the coefficients, possibly very large, are assumed to occur only across the subdomain interfaces $\partial\Omega_i$. In each Ω_i a conforming quasiuniform triangulation with parameters h_i is constructed. We assume that the resulting triangulation in Ω is also conforming, i.e., the meshes are assumed to match across the subdomain interfaces. On the fine triangulation the problem is discretized by a DG method. For solving the resulting discrete system, a FETI-DP type method is proposed and analyzed. It is established that the condition number of the preconditioned linear system is estimated by $C(1+\max_i \log H_i/h_i)^2$ with a constant C independent of h_i, H_i and the jumps of coefficients. The method is well suited for parallel computations and it can be extended to three-dimensional problems. This result is an extension, to the case of full fine-grid DG discretization, of the previous result [SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 51 (2013), pp. 400–422] where it was considered a conforming finite element method

M. Dryja
Department of Mathematics, Warsaw University, Banacha 2, 00-097 Warsaw, Poland.
This research was supported in part by the Polish Sciences Foundation under grant 2011/01/B/ST1/01179.
E-mail: dryja@mimuw.edu.pl

J. Galvis
Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia.
E-mail: jcgalvisa@unal.edu.co

M. Sarkis
Department of Mathematical Sciences at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 100 Institute Road, Worcester, MA 01609, USA, and Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Estrada Dona Castorina 110, CEP 22460-320, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
E-mail: msarkis@wpi.edu

inside the subdomains and a discontinuous Galerkin method only across the subdomain interfaces. Numerical results are presented to validate the theory.

Keywords Interior penalty discretization · discontinuous Galerkin · elliptic problems with discontinuous coefficients · finite element method · FETI-DP algorithms · preconditioners · AMS: 65F10, 65N20, 65N30

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a boundary value problem for elliptic second order partial differential equations with highly discontinuous coefficients and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. The problem is posed on a polygonal region Ω which is a union of disjoint two-dimensional polygonal subdomains Ω_i of diameter $O(H_i)$. We assume that this partition $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is geometrically conforming, i.e., for all i and j with $i \neq j$, the intersection $\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$ is either empty, a common corner or a common edge of Ω_i and Ω_j. We consider the case where the discontinuities of the coefficients are assumed to occur only across $\partial\Omega_i$. The problem is approximated by the symmetric interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin (SIPDG) method inside each Ω_i, with h_i as a mesh parameter. The meshes are assumed to match across the interfaces $\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$. In order to deal with the nonconformity of the DG spaces across $\partial\Omega_i$, a discrete problem is further formulated using the SIPDG method on the $\partial\Omega_i$; see [1,2,3, 14,18]. The main goal of this paper is to develop the FETI-DP methodology for this DG discretization. We show that the designed FETI-DP method is almost optimal with rate of convergence independent of the coefficients jumps. The analysis of the discussed precondicioner is based on the analysis used in [10]. For that we construct refinement of the fine meshes on each Ω_i and introduce special interpolation operators which allow to switch from spaces of piecewise linear functions defined on the fine mesh on Ω_i to spaces of piecewise linear and continuous functions defined on the refinement of the fine mesh on Ω_i and vise-versa. The interpolation operators used in this paper are similar to those introduced [4,19] and also used in [5]. Properties of the interpolations operators are proved in this paper. In this paper we extend our results published in [10] to the full DG discretization of the considered problem. In [10] a FETI-DP preconditioner was designed and analyzed for the problem discretized by composed finite element and DG methods, i.e., by continuous Finite Element Method (FEM) inside each Ω_i and the symmetric interior penalty DG method on the interfaces $\partial\Omega_i$ only, while here in this paper a FETI-DP preconditioner for the case full DG discretization of the problem is designed and analyzed. The proposed FETI-DP algorithm is essentially algebraic and does not require any interpolation operator for the design of the algorithm, therefore, it can be naturally extended to three-dimentional problems and for high-order and discretizations elasticity, Stokes and Maxwell. An interpolation operator is only required for the analysis, and to the best of our knowledge it is the first complete analysis ever developped for any Neumann-Neumann type of discretization such as FETI, FETI-DP, BDD, BDDC and NN, and for any of the

classical interior penalty DG discretizations considered in [1,2,3]. We expect that the analysis developped here can be extended to more general problems as the one mentioned above. We also remark that a new technique based on two interpolation operators were introduced to avoid a condition on the number of elements that can touch a corner of a substructure interface,therefore, the algorithm developed here can applied also for subdomains generated from graph partitioners. Furthermore, we believe that such technique can be extended to other types of full DG discretizations beyond [1,2,3].

For the developing of FETI-DP methods for the continuous FEM, see the Introduction of [10] and the references therein. See also [12,13,15,16,17].

In this paper, the full DG discrete problem is reduced to the Schur complement problem with respect to unknowns on the interfaces of the subdomains Ω_i. For that, discrete harmonic functions defined in a special way, i.e., in the DG sense, are used. We note that there are unknowns on both sides of the interfaces $\partial\Omega_i$. This means that the unknowns on both sides of the interfaces should be kept as degrees of freedom of the linear Schur complement system to be solved. These issues characterize some of the main difficulties on designing and analyzing FETI-DP type methods for full DG discretizations. Distinctively from the classical conforming FEM discretizations, here a double layer of Lagrange multipliers are needed on interfaces rather than a single layer of Lagrange multipliers as normally is seen in FETI-DP for conforming FEMs. Despite the fact we follow the FETI-DP abstract approach, which was aimed to single layer of Lagrange multipliers, see for example [20], in this paper we successfully overcome this difficulty.

The algorithm we develop in this paper is as follows. Let Γ_i' be the union of all edges $\bar{E}_{ij}$ and $\bar{E}_{ji}$ which are common to Ω_i and Ω_j, where $\bar{E}_{ij}$ and $\bar{E}_{ji}$ refer to the Ω_i and Ω_j sides, respectively, see Figure 1. We note that each Γ_i' has interface unknowns (degrees of freedom) corresponding to nodal points which are the endpoint of edges of fine triangulation belonging to $\overline{\partial\Omega_i \setminus \partial\Omega}$ and $\overline{E_{ji}} \subset \partial\Omega_j$. Unknowns corresponding to vertices of fine triangles which intersect $\bar{E}_{ij} \subset \partial\Omega_i$ and $\bar{E}_{ji} \subset \partial\Omega_j$ by only one vertex are treated as interior unknowns. We now need to couple Γ_i' with the other side of the interface Γ_j'. We first impose continuity at the interface unknowns at the corners of Γ_i' (which are corners of Γ_i and common endpoints of $\bar{E}_{ji}$) with the interface unknowns at corners of the Γ_j', see Figure 3. These unknowns are called primal. The remaining interface unknowns on Γ_i' and Γ_j' are called dual and have jumps, hence, Lagrange multipliers are introduced to eliminate these jumps, see Figure 2. For the dual system with Lagrange multipliers, a special block diagonal preconditioner is designed. It leads to independent local problems on Γ_i' for $1 \leq i \leq N$. It is proved that the proposed method is almost optimal with a condition number estimate bounded by $C(1+\max_i \log H_i/h_i)^2$, where C does not depend on h_i, H_i, the number of subdomains Ω_i and the jumps in the coefficients.

The method can be extended to full DG discretizations of three-dimensional problems.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the differential problem and a full DG discretization are formulated. In Section 3, the Schur complement problem is derived using discrete harmonic functions defined in a special way (in the DG sense). In Section 4, the so-called FETI-DP method is introduced, i.e., the Schur complement problem is reformulated by imposing continuity for the primal variables and by using Lagrange multipliers at the dual variables, and a special block diagonal preconditioner is defined. The main results of the paper are Theorem 1 and Lemma 4. Section 5 is devoted to some technical tools and auxiliary lemmas to analyze the FETI-DP preconditioner. The proofs of these results are given in the Appendix A and B. In Section 6 numerical tests are reported which confirm the theoretical results.

2 Differential and discrete problems

In this section we discuss the continuous problem and its DG discretization. The resulting discrete problem is taken into consideration for preconditioning.

2.1 Differential problem

Consider the following problem: *Find* $u^*_{ex} \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ *such that*

$$a(u^*_{ex}, v) = f(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1_0(\Omega), \tag{1}$$

where $\rho_i > 0$ is a constant, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and

$$a(u,v) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega_i} \rho_i(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad f(v) := \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx.$$

We assume that $\overline{\Omega} = \cup_{i=1}^{N} \overline{\Omega}_i$ and the substructures Ω_i are disjoint shaped regular polygonal subregions of diameter $O(H_i)$. We assume that the partition $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^{N}$ is geometrically conforming, i.e., for all i and j with $i \neq j$, the intersection $\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$ is either empty, a common corner or a common edge of Ω_i and Ω_j. For clarity we stress that here and below the identifier *edge* means a curve of continuous intervals and its two endpoints are called corners. The collection of these corners on $\partial\Omega_i$ are referred as the set of corners of Ω_i. Let us denote $\bar{E}_{ij} := \partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$ as an edge of $\partial\Omega_i$ and $\bar{E}_{ji} := \partial\Omega_j \cap \partial\Omega_i$ as an edge of $\partial\Omega_j$. Sometimes we use the notation E_{ijh} and E_{jih} to refer the sets of nodal points of the triangulation on E_{ij} and E_{ji} inherit from $\mathcal{T}^i_h$ and $\mathcal{T}^j_h$, respectively, where the triangulations are defined below. Additionally we use the notation $\bar{E}_{ijh}$ and $\bar{E}_{jih}$ when the endpoints are included. Let us denote by $\mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H$ the set of indices j such that Ω_j has a common edge E_{ji} with Ω_i. To take into account edges of Ω_i which belong to the global boundary $\partial\Omega$, let us introduce a set of indices $\mathcal{J}^{i,\partial}_H$ to refer these edges. The set of indices of all edges of Ω_i is denoted by $\mathcal{J}^i_H = \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H \cup \mathcal{J}^{i,\partial}_H$.

2.2 Discrete problem

Let us introduce a shape regular and quasiuniform triangulation (with triangular elements) $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ on Ω_i and let h_i represent its mesh size. The resulting triangulation on Ω is matching across $\partial\Omega_i$. Let

$$X_i(\Omega_i) := \prod_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_h^i} X_\tau$$

be the product space of finite element (FE) spaces X_τ which consist of linear functions on the element τ belonging to $\mathcal{T}_h^i$. We note that a function $u_i \in X_i(\Omega_i)$ allows discontinuities across elements of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$. We also note that we do not assume that functions in $X_i(\Omega_i)$ vanish on $\partial\Omega$.

The global DG finite element space we consider is defined by

$$X(\Omega) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} X_i(\Omega_i) \equiv X_1(\Omega_1) \times X_2(\Omega_2) \times \cdots \times X_N(\Omega_N). \tag{2}$$

We define $\mathcal{E}_h^{i,0}$ as the set of edges of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ which are inside Ω_i, and by $\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}$, for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^i$, the set of edges of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ which are on E_{ij}. An edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{i,0}$ is shared by two elements denoted by τ_+ and τ_- of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ with outward unit normal vectors $\mathbf{n}^+$ and $\mathbf{n}^-$, respectively, and denote

$$\{\rho\nabla u\} = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_{\tau_+}\nabla u_{\tau_+} + \rho_{\tau_-}\nabla u_{\tau_-}) \quad \text{and} \quad [u] = u_{\tau_+}\mathbf{n}^+ + u_{\tau_-}\mathbf{n}^-.$$

An edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{i,\partial}$ is shared by one element denoted by τ with outward unit normal vectors $\mathbf{n}$, and denote

$$\{\rho\nabla u\} = \rho_\tau\nabla u_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad [u] = u_\tau\mathbf{n}.$$

The discrete problem we consider by the DG method is of the form: *Find* $u^* = \{u_i^*\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$ *where* $u_i^* \in X_i(\Omega_i)$*, such that*

$$a_h(u^*, v) = f(v) \qquad \text{for all } v = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega), \tag{3}$$

where the global bilinear from a_h and the right hand side f are assembled as

$$a_h(u, v) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i'(u, v) \ \text{ and } \ f(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega_i} f v_i \, dx. \tag{4}$$

Here, the local bilinear forms a_i', $i = 1, \ldots, N$, are defined as

$$a_i'(u, v) := a_i(u_i, v_i) + s_{i,0}(u_i, v_i) + p_{i,0}(u, v) + s_{i,\partial}(u, v) + p_{i,\partial}(u, v) \tag{5}$$

where a_i is the local energy bilinear form,

$$a_i(u_i, v_i) := \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_h^i} \int_\tau \rho_i \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla v_i \, dx. \tag{6}$$

The (interior edges) symmetrized bilinear form $s_{i,0}$ is defined by

$$s_{i,0}(u_i, v_i) := -\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^{i,0}} \int_e \{\rho_i \nabla u_i\} \cdot [v_i] + \{\rho_i \nabla v_i\} \cdot [u_i]\, ds, \tag{7}$$

and the (interior edges) penalty bilinear form is given by

$$p_{i,0}(u, v) := \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^{i,0}} \int_e \delta \frac{\rho_i}{h_e} [u_i].[v_i]\, ds. \tag{8}$$

The corresponding symmetric and penalty form over the local interface edges are given by

$$s_{i,\partial}(u, v) := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^i} \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}} \int_e \frac{1}{l_{ij}} \left(\rho_i \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n}(v_j - v_i) + \rho_i \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial n}(u_j - u_i) \right) ds \tag{9}$$

and

$$p_{i,\partial}(u, v) := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^i} \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}} \int_e \frac{\delta}{l_{ij}} \frac{\rho_i}{h_e} (u_i - u_j)(v_i - v_j)\, ds \tag{10}$$

respectively. Here and above, h_e denotes the length of the edge e. When $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ we set $l_{ij} = 2$, while when $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,\partial}$ we denote the boundary edges $E_{ij} \subset \partial\Omega_i$ by $E_{i\partial}$ and set $l_{i\partial} = 1$, and on the artificial edge $E_{ji} \equiv E_{\partial i}$ we set $u_\partial = 0$ and $v_\partial = 0$. The partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial n}$ denotes the outward normal derivative on $\partial\Omega_i$ and δ is the penalty positive parameter.

Remark 1 The discrete formulation used here is useful for the adequate formulation of our FETI-DP method. We note that (9) and (10) can also be written in the same form as in (7) and (8) without the term ℓ_{ij} (since now the edges are counted once). We note also that others DG formulations for discontinuous coefficients can also be considered [3,6]. We note that the design of FETI-DP methods for those formulations are the same, and the analysis are simple modifications of the proofs we present here in this paper. See for instance [7,9,8] where a formulation based on harmonic averages of the coefficients is studied. Some details for these case as well as numerical experiments will be presented elsewhere. We note that three-dimensional versions can also be formulated and analyzed by extending naturaly some ideas from this paper and from [11].

For $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N, v = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$, let us introduce the local positive bilinear forms

$$d_i(u, v) := a_i(u, v) + p_{i,0}(u, v) + p_{i,\partial}(u, v) \tag{11}$$

and the global positive bilinear form assembled as

$$d_h(u, v) := \sum_{i=1}^N d_i(u, v). \tag{12}$$

Note that the norm defined by $d_h(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a broken norm in $X(\Omega)$ with weights given by ρ_i, $\delta\frac{\rho_i}{h_e}$ and $\frac{\delta}{l_{ij}}\frac{\rho_i}{h_e}$. For $u=\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$, this discrete norm is defined by $\parallel u \parallel_h^2 = d_h(u,u)$.

It is known that there exists a $\delta_0 = O(1) > 0$ and a positive constant c, which does not depend on ρ_i, H_i, h_i and u_i, such that for every $\delta \geq \delta_0$ we obtain $|s_i(u,u)| \leq c d_i(u,u)$ and therefore, the following lemma is valid.

Lemma 1 *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for $\delta \geq \delta_0$ and for all $u \in X(\Omega)$ we have, in each subdomain,*

$$\gamma_0 d_i(u,u) \leq a_i'(u,u) \leq \gamma_1 d_i(u,u), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \tag{13}$$

and also we have the following global bilinear forms inequality

$$\gamma_0 d_h(u,u) \leq a_h(u,u) \leq \gamma_1 d_h(u,u). \tag{14}$$

Here, γ_0 and γ_1 are positive constants independent of the ρ_i, h_i, H_i and u.

The proof of this lemma is a modification of the proof of [7, Lemma 2.1], [9] or [6, Theorem 4.1], therefore it is omitted.

Lemma 1 implies that the discrete problem (3) is elliptic and continuous, therefore, the solution exists and it is unique and stable. An optimal a priori error estimate of this method was established in [1,2] for the continuous coefficient case. We mention here that Lemma 1 together with Lemma 7, see below, are going to be fundamental for establishing condition number estimates for the FETI-DP preconditioned system developed in the remaining sections.

3 Schur complement matrices and discrete harmonic extensions

The first step of many iterative substructuring solvers, such as the FETI-DP method that we consider in this paper, requires the elimination of unknowns interior to the subdomains. In this section, we describe this step for DG discretizations.

We introduce some notation and then formulate (3) as a variational problem with constraints. Associated to a subdomain Ω_i, we define the extended subdomain Ω_i' by

$$\Omega_i' := \overline{\Omega}_i \bigcup \{\cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} \bar{E}_{ji}\}$$

i.e., it is the union of $\overline{\Omega}_i$ and the $\bar{E}_{ji} \subset \partial\Omega_j$ such that $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$, and the local interfaces Γ_i by

$$\Gamma_i := \overline{\partial\Omega_i \backslash \partial\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_i' := \Gamma_i \bigcup \{\cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} \bar{E}_{ji}\}.$$



Fig. 1 Illustration of the classification of degrees of freedom related to subdomain Ω_i.

We also introduce the sets

$$\Gamma := \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \Gamma_i, \quad \Gamma' := \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Gamma'_i, \quad I_i := \Omega'_i \backslash \Gamma'_i \quad \text{and} \quad I := \prod_{i=1}^{N} I_i. \tag{15}$$

Associated to these sets, we classify degrees of freedom (DG nodal values) on Ω'_i. We illustrate this classification (along with further classifications to be introduced later) in Figure 1:

- Γ_i-degres of freedom: The nodal points which are endpoints of edges of $\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$.
- Degrees $\mathcal{V}_i$: The nodal points which are both an endpoint of an edges of $\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ and a corner of Ω_i.
- Γ'_i-degrees of freedom: It is the union of the degrees Γ_i and the nodal points which are endpoints of edges of $\mathcal{E}_h^{j,i}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$.
- $\mathcal{V}'_i$-degrees of freedom: It is the union of the degrees $\mathcal{V}_i$, and the nodal points which are both an endpoint of an edge of $\mathcal{E}_h^{j,i}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ and a corner of Ω_j.
- I_i-degrees of freedom: The nodal points which are vertices of elements τ of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ and are not endpoints of an edge of τ in $\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$.
- $\overline{\Omega}_i$-degrees of freedom: The union of Γ_i and I_i degrees of freedom.
- Ω'_i-degrees of freedom: The union of Γ'_i and I_i degrees of freedom.

Remark 2 Nodal points of elements in $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ which intersect $\bar{E}_{ij}$ by only one vertex are treated as I_i degrees of freedom. The trace of the basis DG functions associated to these nodal points are zero almost everywhere on Γ_i, hence, the analysis shows that it is convenient to treat these nodes as as I_i-degrees of freedom as defined above. For the same reason, nodal points of elements of $\mathcal{T}_h^j$ which intersect $\bar{E}_{ji}$ by vertex only for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$, are not included as Ω_i'-degrees of freedom. We point out, however, that we could have considered these nodes points as Γ_i and Ω_i'-degrees of freedom, respectively as well, and by introducing also Lagrange multipliers to force continuity at these type of nodal values, and then eliminating these Lagrange multipliers and also these degrees of freedom. This approach would be equivalent to the approach we consider and analyze here in this paper.

We mention that if we refer to the classical FETI-DP design, i.e., for continuous FEM, the set I corresponds to the set of interior degrees of freedom (that are block-uncoupled) and can be eliminated in a first step. Moreover, the Γ corresponds to the global interface with the original coupling and Γ' corresponds to the (block-wise) torn interface. We recall that the classical FETI-DP design extends the original problem to a problem in the torn interface space and then construct and implement suitable restrictions to interconnect back some of the broken coupling between degrees of freedom. We now describe these steps for DG discretization in detail. First we introduce the corresponding functions spaces.

Let $W_i(\Omega_i')$ be the FE space of functions defined by values on Ω_i'

$$W_i(\Omega_i') = W_i(\overline{\Omega}_i) \times \prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} W_i(\bar{E}_{ji}), \tag{16}$$

where $W_i(\overline{\Omega}_i) := X_i(\Omega_i)$ and $W_i(\bar{E}_{ji})$ is the trace of the DG space $X_j(\Omega_j)$ on $\bar{E}_{ji} \subset \partial\Omega_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$. A function $u_i' \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ is defined by the Ω_i'-degrees of freedom. Below, we denote u_i' by u_i if it is not confused with functions of $X_i(\Omega_i)$. A function $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ is represented as

$$u_i = \{(u_i)_i, \{(u_i)_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\},$$

where $(u_i)_i := u_{i\,|\overline{\Omega}_i}$ (u_i restricted to $\overline{\Omega}_i$) and $(u_i)_j := u_{i\,|\bar{E}_{ji}}$ (u_i restricted to $\bar{E}_{ji}$). Here and below we use the same notation to identify both DG functions and their vector representations. Note that $a_i'(\cdot,\cdot)$, see (5), is defined on $W_i(\Omega_i') \times W_i(\Omega_i')$ with corresponding stiffness matrix A_i' defined by

$$a_i'(u_i, v_i) = \langle A_i' u_i, v_i \rangle \quad u_i, v_i \in W_i(\Omega_i'), \tag{17}$$

where $\langle u_i, v_i \rangle$ denotes the ℓ_2 inner product of nodal values associated to the vector space in consideration. We also represent $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ as $u_i = (u_{i,I}, u_{i,\Gamma'})$ where $u_{i,\Gamma'}$ represents values of u_i at nodal points on Γ_i' and $u_{i,I}$ at the interior nodal points in I_i, see (15). Hence, let us represent $W_i(\Omega_i')$ as

the vector spaces $W_i(I_i) \times W_i(\Gamma_i')$. Using the representation $u_i = (u_{i,I}, u_{i,\Gamma'})$, the matrix A_i' can be represented as

$$A_i' = \begin{pmatrix} A_{i,II}' & A_{i,I\Gamma'}' \\ A_{i,\Gamma' I}' & A_{i,\Gamma'\Gamma'}' \end{pmatrix}, \tag{18}$$

where the block rows and columns correspond to the nodal points of I_i and Γ_i', respectively.

The Schur complement of A_i' with respect to $u_{i,\Gamma'}$ is of the form

$$S_i' := A_{i,\Gamma'\Gamma'}' - A_{i,\Gamma' I}'(A_{i,II}')^{-1} A_{i,I\Gamma'}' \tag{19}$$

and introduce the block diagonal matrix $S' = \mathrm{diag}\{S_i'\}_{i=1}^N$. Note that S_i' satisfies

$$\langle S_i' u_{i,\Gamma'}, u_{i,\Gamma'} \rangle \;=\; \min\; a_i'(w_i, w_i), \tag{20}$$

where the minimum is taken over $w_i = (w_{i,I}, w_{i,\Gamma'}) \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ such that $w_{i,\Gamma'} = u_{i,\Gamma'}$ on Γ_i'. The bilinear form $a_i'(\cdot,\cdot)$ is symmetric and nonnegative, see Lemma 1. The minimizing function satisfying (20) is called discrete harmonic in the sense of $a_i'(\cdot,\cdot)$ or in the sense of $\mathcal{H}_i'$. An equivalent definition of the minimizing function $\mathcal{H}_i' u_{i,\Gamma'} \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ is given by the solution of

$$a_i'(\mathcal{H}_i' u_{i,\Gamma'}, v_{i,\Gamma'}) = 0 \qquad v_{i,\Gamma'} \in \overset{o}{W}_i(\Omega_i'), \tag{21}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_i' u_{i,\Gamma'} = u_{i,\Gamma'} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i', \tag{22}$$

where $\overset{o}{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ is the subspace of $W_i(\Omega_i')$ of functions which vanish on Γ_i'. We note that for substructures Ω_i which intersect $\partial\Omega$ by edges, the nodal values of $W_i(\Omega_i')$ on $\partial\Omega_i \backslash \Gamma_i \subset \partial\Omega$ are treated as unknowns and belong to I_i.

Let us introduce the product space

$$W(\Omega') := \prod_{i=1}^N W_i(\Omega_i'), \tag{23}$$

i.e., $u \in W(\Omega')$ means that $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N$ where $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$; see (16) for the definition of $W_i(\Omega_i')$. Recall that we write $(u_i)_i = u_{i\,|\overline{\Omega}_i}$ (u_i restricted to $\overline{\Omega}_i$) and $(u_i)_j = u_{i\,|\bar{E}_{ji}}$ (u_i restricted to $\bar{E}_{ji}$). Using the representation $u_i = (u_{i,I}, u_{i,\Gamma'})$ where $u_{i,I} \in W_i(I_i)$ and $u_{i,\Gamma'} \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$, see (18), let us introduce the product space

$$W(\Gamma') := \prod_{i=1}^N W_i(\Gamma_i'), \tag{24}$$

i.e., $u_{\Gamma'} \in W(\Gamma')$ means that $u_{\Gamma'} = \{u_{i,\Gamma'}\}_{i=1}^N$ where $u_{i,\Gamma'} \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$. The space $W(\Gamma')$ which was defined on Γ' only, is also interpreted below as the subspace of $W(\Omega')$ of functions which are discrete harmonic in the sense of $\mathcal{H}_i'$

in each Ω_i.

We now consider the subspaces $\hat{W}(\Omega') \subset W(\Omega')$ and $\hat{W}(\Gamma') \subset W(\Gamma')$ as the space of functions which are continuous on Γ in the sense of the following definition (for notation see (15)).



Fig. 2 Illustration of the continuity on Γ.

Definition 1 (Spaces $\hat{W}(\Omega')$ and $\hat{W}(\Gamma')$) We say that $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in W(\Omega')$ is continuous on Γ if for all i, $1 \le i \le N$, we have

$$(u_i)_i(x) = (u_j)_i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{E}_{ij} \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0} \tag{25}$$

and

$$(u_i)_j(x) = (u_j)_j(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{E}_{ji} \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}. \tag{26}$$

In Figure 2 we illustrate this continuity by assigning the same nodal value for nodes connected by a line. The subspace of $W(\Omega')$ of continuous functions on Γ is denoted by $\hat{W}(\Omega')$, and the subspace of $\hat{W}(\Omega')$ of functions which are discrete harmonic in the sense of $\mathcal{H}_i'$ in each Ω_i is denoted by $\hat{W}(\Gamma')$.

Note that there is a one-to-one correspondence between vectors in the spaces $X(\Omega)$ and $\hat{W}(\Omega')$. Indeed, let us introduce the restriction matrices $R_{\Omega_i'} : X(\Omega) \to W_i(\Omega_i')$ which assign uniquely the vector values of $u =$

$\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$ where $u_i \in X_i(\Omega_i)$, see (2), to $v_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ defined by $(v_i)_i = u_i$ on $\overline{\Omega}_i$ and $(v_i)_j = u_j$ on $\bar{E}_{ji}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$. It is easy to see that $v := \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$ where $v_i := R_{\Omega_i'} u$ belongs to $\hat{W}(\hat{\Omega})$. And vice-versa, for each $v = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N \in \hat{W}(\Omega)$, we can define uniquely $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$ by setting $u_i = (v_i)_i$. Since u and v have identical nodal values, we refer sometimes $u \in \hat{W}(\Omega')$ or $u \in X(\Omega)$. For instance, the solution u^* of (3) can be interpreted as a function in $\hat{W}(\Omega')$ or in $X(\Omega)$.

Note that the discrete problem (3) can be written as a system of algebraic equations

$$\hat{A}u^* = f \tag{27}$$

for $u^* \in X(\Omega)$ using the standard FE basis functions, and $f = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$, where f_i is the load vector associated with individual subdomains Ω_i, i.e., is $\int_\Omega f v_i$ when v_i are the canonical basis functions of $X_i(\Omega_i)$. The stiffness matrix $\hat{A}$ can be obtained by assembling the matrices A_i', see (17), from $W(\Omega')$ to $X(\Omega)$ as

$$\hat{A} = \sum_{i=1}^N R_{\Omega_i'}^T A_i' R_{\Omega_i'}.$$

Note that the matrix $\hat{A}$ is not block diagonal since there are couplings between substructures due to the continuity on Γ, see Defintion 1.

Note also that $X(\Omega)$ can be componentwise represented by $X(I) \times X(\Gamma)$, denoted also by $X(\Omega)$, where $X(I) := \prod_{i=1}^N X_i(I_i)$ is the vector space of functions defined by nodal values on I_i, and $X(\Gamma) := \prod_{i=1}^N X_i(\Gamma_i)$ by the nodal values on Γ_i, see (15) and Figure 1. Hence, we can represent $u \in X(\Omega)$ as $u = (u_I, u_\Gamma)$ with $u_I \in X(I)$ and $u_\Gamma \in X(\Gamma)$. We introduce the restriction $R_{\Gamma_i'} : X(\Gamma) \to W_i(\Gamma_i')$ by assigning values $u_\Gamma \in X(\Gamma)$ into $u_i \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$ at the nodes of Γ_i'. By eliminating the variable $u_I^* = \{u_{i,I}^*\}_{i=1}^N$ of $u^* = (u_I^*, u_\Gamma^*)$ from (27), see (18) and (19), it is easy to see that

$$\hat{S} u_\Gamma^* = \hat{g}_\Gamma \tag{28}$$

where

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^N R_{\Gamma_i'}^T S_i' R_{\Gamma_i'} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{g}_\Gamma = f_\Gamma - \sum_{i=1}^N R_{\Gamma_i'}^T A_{i,\Gamma' I}' (A_{i,II}')^{-1} f_i, \tag{29}$$

with $f_\Gamma := \{f_{i,\Gamma}\}_{i=1}^N$ and $f_{i,\Gamma} \in X_i(\Gamma_i)$. Here, the load vector $f_{i,\Gamma}$ is defined by $\int_{\Omega_i} f v_{i,\Gamma}$ when $v_{i,\Gamma}$ are the cannonical basis functions of $X_i(\Omega_i)$ associated to nodes on Γ_i. It is also easy to see from (21) and (22) that

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_{i,I} \\ v_{i,\Gamma'} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} A_{i,II}' & A_{i,I\Gamma'}' \\ A_{i,\Gamma' I}' & A_{i,\Gamma'\Gamma'}' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_i' u_{i,\Gamma'} \\ u_{i,\Gamma'} \end{pmatrix} = \langle S_i' u_{i,\Gamma'}, v_{i,\Gamma'} \rangle. \tag{30}$$

Note that $\hat{W}(\Gamma')$ is the natural space for defining $\langle \hat{S}\,\cdot, \cdot \rangle$ due to (29), (30) and the continuity of $\hat{W}(\Gamma')$ on Γ, see Definition 1.

4 FETI-DP with corner constraints

We now design a FETI-DP method for solving (28). We follow the abstract approach described in pages 160-167 in [20].

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, we introduce the nodal points associated to the corner unknowns, see Figure 1, by

$$\mathcal{V}_i' := \mathcal{V}_i \bigcup \{\cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} \partial E_{ji}\} \qquad \text{where} \qquad \mathcal{V}_i := \{\cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} \partial E_{ij}\}. \tag{31}$$

We now consider the subspace $\tilde{W}(\Omega') \subset W(\Omega')$ and $\tilde{W}(\Gamma') \subset W(\Gamma')$ as the space of functions which are continuous on all the $\mathcal{V}_i$ in the sense of the following definition:



Fig. 3 Illustration of the continuity at the corners.

Definition 2 (Subspaces $\tilde{W}(\Omega')$ and $\tilde{W}(\Gamma')$) We say that $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in W(\Omega')$ is continuous at the corners $\mathcal{V}_i'$ if for $1 \leq i \leq N$ we have

$$(u_i)_i(x) = (u_j)_i(x) \quad \text{at } x \in \partial E_{ij} \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0} \tag{32}$$

and

$$(u_i)_j(x) = (u_j)_j(x) \quad \text{at } x \in \partial E_{ji} \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}. \tag{33}$$

In Figure 3 we illustrate this continuity by assigning the same nodal value at nodes (corners) connected by a line. The subspace of $W(\Omega')$ of continuous

functions at the corners $\mathcal{V}_i'$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$ is denoted by $\tilde{W}(\Omega')$, and the subspace of $\tilde{W}(\Omega')$ of functions which are discrete harmonic in the sense of $\mathcal{H}_i'$ is denoted by $\tilde{W}(\Gamma')$.

Note that

$$\hat{W}(\Gamma') \subset \tilde{W}(\Gamma') \subset W(\Gamma'). \tag{34}$$

Let $\tilde{A}$ be the stiffness matrix which is obtained by assembling the matrices A_i' for $1 \leq i \leq N$, from $W(\Omega')$ to $\tilde{W}(\Omega')$. Note that the matrix $\tilde{A}$ is no longer block diagonal since there are couplings between variables at the corners $\mathcal{V}_i'$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. We will represent $u \in \tilde{W}(\Omega')$ as $u = (u_I, u_\Pi, u_\triangle)$ where the subscript I refers to the interior degrees of freedom at nodal points $I = \prod_{i=1}^N I_i$, the Π refers to the corners $\mathcal{V}_i'$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$, and the $\triangle$ refers to the remaining nodal points, i.e., the nodal points $\Gamma_i' \backslash \mathcal{V}_i'$, for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. The vector $u = (u_I, u_\Pi, u_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Omega')$ is obtained from the vector $u = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in W(\Omega')$ using the equations (32), (33), i.e., the continuity of u on $\mathcal{V}_i'$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Using the decomposition $u = (u_I, u_\Pi, u_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Omega')$ we can partition $\tilde{A}$ as

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{II}' & A_{I\Pi}' & A_{I\triangle}' \\ A_{\Pi I}' & \tilde{A}_{\Pi\Pi} & A_{\Pi\triangle}' \\ A_{\triangle I}' & A_{\triangle\Pi}' & A_{\triangle\triangle}' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

We note that the only couplings across subdomains are through the variables Π where the matrix $\tilde{A}$ is subassembled.

A Schur complement of $\tilde{A}$ with respect to the $\triangle$-unknowns (eliminating the I- and the Π-unknowns) is of the form

$$\tilde{S} := A_{\triangle\triangle}' - (A_{\triangle I}' \; A_{\triangle\Pi}') \begin{pmatrix} A_{II}' & A_{I\Pi}' \\ A_{\Pi I}' & \tilde{A}_{\Pi\Pi} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} A_{I\triangle}' \\ A_{\Pi\triangle}' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{36}$$

A vector $u \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ can uniquely be represented by $u = (u_\Pi, u_\triangle)$, therefore, we can represent $\tilde{W}(\Gamma') = \hat{W}_\Pi(\Gamma') \times W_\triangle(\Gamma')$, where $\hat{W}_\Pi(\Gamma')$ refers to the Π-degrees of freedom of $\tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ while $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ to the $\triangle$-degrees of freedom of $\tilde{W}(\Gamma')$. The vector space $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ can be decomposed as

$$W_\triangle(\Gamma') = \prod_{i=1}^N W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i') \tag{37}$$

where the local space $W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i')$ refers to the degrees of freedom associated to the nodes of $\Gamma_i' \backslash \mathcal{V}_i'$ for $i = 1 \leq i \leq N$. Hence, a vector $u \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ can be represented as $u = (u_\Pi, u_\triangle)$ with $u_\Pi \in \hat{W}_\Pi(\Gamma')$ and $u_\triangle = \{u_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ where $u_{i,\triangle} \in W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i')$. Note that $\tilde{S}$, see (36), is defined on the vector space $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$, and the following lemma follows (cf. Lemma 6.22 in [20] and Lemma 4.2 in [17]):

Lemma 2 *Let $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ and let $\tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{A}$, defined in (36) and (35), respectively. Then,*

$$\langle \tilde{S}u_\triangle, u_\triangle\rangle \ = \min\langle \tilde{A}w, w\rangle \tag{38}$$

where the minimum is taken over $w = (w_I, w_\Pi, w_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Omega)$ such that $w_\triangle = u_\triangle$.

Let us take $u \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ as $u = (u_\Pi, u_\triangle)$ with $u_\Pi \in \hat{W}_\Pi(\Gamma')$ and $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$, where $u_\triangle = \{u_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N$ with $u_{i,\triangle} \in W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i')$. The vector $u_{i,\triangle} \in W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i')$ can be partitioned as

$$u_{i,\triangle} = \{(u_{i,\triangle})_i, \{(u_{i,\triangle})_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\}$$

where

$$(u_{i,\triangle})_i = u_{i,\triangle|_{\Gamma_i\setminus\mathcal{V}_i}} \ \text{ and } \ (u_{i,\triangle})_j = u_{i,\triangle|_{E_{ji}}}.$$

In order to measure the jump of $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ across the $\triangle$-nodes let us introduce the space $\hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$ defined by

$$\hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma) = \prod_{i=1}^N X_i(\Gamma_i\setminus\mathcal{V}_i),$$

where $X_i(\Gamma_i\setminus\mathcal{V}_i)$ is the restriction of $X_i(\Omega_i)$ to $\Gamma_i\setminus\mathcal{V}_i$, see Figure 1. To define the jumping matrix $B_\triangle : W_\triangle(\Gamma') \to \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$, let $u_\triangle = \{u_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ and let $v := B_\triangle u$ where $v = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N \in \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$ is defined by

$$v_i = (u_{i,\triangle})_i - (u_{j,\triangle})_i \ \text{ on } \ E_{ijh} \ \text{ for all } \quad j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}. \tag{39}$$

The jumping matrix $B_\triangle$ can be written as

$$B_\triangle = (B_\triangle^{(1)}, B_\triangle^{(2)}, \cdots, B_\triangle^{(N)}), \tag{40}$$

where the rectangular matrix $B_\triangle^{(i)}$ consists of columns of $B_\triangle$ attributed to the (i) components of functions of $W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma_i')$ of the product space $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$, see (37). The entries of the rectangular matrix consist of values of $\{0, 1, -1\}$. It is easy to see that the Range $B_\triangle = \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$, so $B_\triangle$ is full rank. In addition, if $u = (u_\Pi, u_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ and $B_\triangle u_\triangle = 0$ then $u \in \hat{W}(\Gamma')$.

We can reformulate the problem (28) as the variational problem with constraints in $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ space: *Find $u_\triangle^* \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ such that*

$$J(u_\triangle^*) = \min J(v_\triangle) \tag{41}$$

subject to $v_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ with constraints $B_\triangle v_\triangle = 0$, where

$$J(v_\triangle) := 1/2\langle \tilde{S}v_\triangle, v_\triangle\rangle - \langle \tilde{g}_\triangle, v_\triangle\rangle \tag{42}$$

where $\tilde{S}$ is defined in (36) and

$$\tilde{g}_\triangle := f_\triangle - (A'_{\triangle I}\ A'_{\triangle \Pi}) \begin{pmatrix} A'_{II} & A'_{I\Pi} \\ A'_{\Pi I} & \tilde{A}_{\Pi\Pi} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} f_I \\ f_\Pi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{43}$$

We note that $f = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X(\Omega)$ was defined in (27) and it can be represented as $f = (f_I, f_\Pi, f_{\Gamma\setminus\Pi})$. It remains to define $f_\triangle$ in (43). The forcing term $f_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ is defined by $f_\triangle = \{f_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N$ where $f_{i,\triangle}$ are the load vectors associated with the individual subdomains Ω_i, i.e., the entries $f_{i,\Delta}$ are defined as $\int_{\Omega_i} f v_{i,\Delta} dx$ when $v_{i,\Delta}$ are the canonical basis functions of $W_{i,\Delta}(\Gamma'_i)$. Note that $\tilde{S}$ is symmetric and positive definite since $\tilde{A}$ has these properties; see also Lemma 2. Introducing Lagrange multipliers $\lambda \in \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$, the problem (41) reduces to the saddle point problem of the form: *Find* $u^*_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ *and* $\lambda^* \in \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$ *such that*

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{S}u^*_\triangle + B^T_\triangle \lambda^* = \tilde{g}_\triangle \\ B_\triangle u^*_\triangle = 0. \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

Hence, (44) reduces to

$$F\lambda^* = g \tag{45}$$

where

$$F := B_\triangle \tilde{S}^{-1} B^T_\triangle, \qquad g := B_\triangle \tilde{S}^{-1} \tilde{g}_\triangle. \tag{46}$$

When λ^* is computed, $u^*_\triangle$ can be found by solving the problem

$$\tilde{S}u^*_\triangle = \tilde{g}_\triangle - B^T_\triangle \lambda^*. \tag{47}$$

4.1 Dirichlet Preconditioner

We now define the FETI-DP preconditioner for F, see (46). Let $S'_{i,\triangle}$ be the Schur complement of S'_i, see (19), restricted to $W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma'_i) \subset W_i(\Gamma'_i)$, i.e., taken S'_i on functions in $W_i(\Gamma'_i)$ which vanish on $\mathcal{V}'_i$. Let

$$S'_\triangle := \mathrm{diag}\{S'_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N. \tag{48}$$

In other words, $S'_{i,\triangle}$ is obtained from S'_i by deleting rows and columns corresponding to nodal values at nodal points of $\mathcal{V}'_i \subset \Gamma'_i$.

Let us introduce diagonal scaling matrices $D^{(i)}_\triangle : W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma'_i) \to W_{i,\triangle}(\Gamma'_i)$, for $1 \le i \le N$. The diagonal entry of $D^{(i)}_\triangle$ associated to a node $x \in \Gamma'_i \setminus \mathcal{V}'_i$, which we denote by $D^{(i)}_\triangle(x)$, is defined by

$$D^{(i)}_\triangle(x) = \frac{\rho_j^\beta}{\rho_i^\beta + \rho_j^\beta} \ \text{ for } \ x \in \{E_{ijh} \cup E_{jih}\} \ \text{ for } \ j \in \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H, \tag{49}$$

for $\beta \in [1/2, \infty)$, see [19], and define

$$B_{D,\triangle} = (B_\triangle^{(1)} D_\triangle^{(1)}, \cdots, B_\triangle^{(N)} D_\triangle^{(N)}). \tag{50}$$

Let

$$P_\triangle := B_{D,\triangle}^T B_\triangle \tag{51}$$

which maps $W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ into itself. It is easy to check that for $w_\triangle = \{w_{i,\triangle}\}_{i=1}^N \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ and $v_\triangle := P_\triangle w_\triangle$, the following equalities hold:

$$(v_{i,\triangle})_i(x) = \frac{\rho_j^\beta}{\rho_i^\beta + \rho_j^\beta}[(w_{i,\triangle})_i(x) - (w_{j,\triangle})_i(x)], \qquad x \in E_{ijh}, \tag{52}$$

$$(v_{i,\triangle})_j(x) = \frac{\rho_j^\beta}{\rho_i^\beta + \rho_j^\beta}[(w_{i,\triangle})_j(x) - (w_{j,\triangle})_j(x)], \qquad x \in E_{jih}. \tag{53}$$

Note that

$$(v_{j,\triangle})_j(x) = \frac{\rho_i^\beta}{\rho_i^\beta + \rho_j^\beta}[(w_{j,\triangle})_j(x) - (w_{i,\triangle})_j(x)], \qquad x \in E_{jih}, \tag{54}$$

$$(v_{j,\triangle})_i(x) = \frac{\rho_i^\beta}{\rho_i^\beta + \rho_j^\beta}[(w_{j,\triangle})_i(x)) - (w_{i,\triangle})_i(x))], \qquad x \in E_{ijh}. \tag{55}$$

By subtracting (55) from (52) and (53) from (54) we see that $P_\triangle$ preserves jumps in the sense that

$$B_\triangle P_\triangle = B_\triangle. \tag{56}$$

From this follows that $P_\triangle$ is a projection ($P_\triangle^2 = P_\triangle$).

In the FETI-DP method, the preconditioner M^{-1} is defined as follows:

$$M^{-1} = B_{D,\triangle} S'_\triangle B_{D,\triangle}^T = \sum_{i=1}^N B_\triangle^{(i)} D_\triangle^{(i)} S'_{i,\triangle} D_\triangle^{(i)} (B_\triangle^{(i)})^T. \tag{57}$$

Note that M^{-1} is a block-diagonal matrix, and each block is invertible since $S'_{i,\triangle}$ and $D_\triangle^{(i)}$ are invertible and $B_\triangle^{(i)}$ is a full rank matrix. The following theorem holds.

Theorem 1 *For any $\lambda \in \hat{W}_\triangle(\Gamma)$ it holds that*

$$\langle M\lambda, \lambda\rangle \;\le\; \langle F\lambda, \lambda\rangle \;\le\; C(1 + \log\frac{H}{h})^2 \langle M\lambda, \lambda\rangle \tag{58}$$

where C is a positive constant independent of h_i, h_i/h_j, H_i, λ and the jumps of ρ_i. Here and below, $\log(\frac{H}{h}) := \max_{i=1}^N \log(\frac{H_i}{h_i})$.

Proof We follow to the general abstract theory for FETI-DP methods developed in Theorem 6.35 of [20]. This abstract theory relies only on duality and linear algebra arguments, and properties such as that $B_\triangle$ is full rank, $P_\triangle$ is a projection, $\tilde{S}$ is invertible and the subspace inclusion (34). Using the same abstract arguments, the proof of the theorem follows by checking the Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, see below. The proof of Lemma 4 is not algebraic and it depends on the problem. The proofs of these two lemmas are presented separately below.

Lemma 3 *For $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ it follows that*

$$\langle \tilde{S} u_\triangle, u_\triangle \rangle \;\; \leq \;\; \langle S'_\triangle u_\triangle, u_\triangle \rangle. \tag{59}$$

Proof The proof follows from Lemma 2 and from

$$\langle \tilde{S} u_\triangle, u_\triangle \rangle = \min \langle \tilde{A} w, w \rangle \;\; \leq \;\; \min \langle \tilde{A} v, v \rangle \;\; = \;\; \langle S'_\triangle u_\triangle, u_\triangle \rangle \tag{60}$$

where the minima are taken over $w = (w_I, w_\Pi, w_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Omega')$ such that $w_\triangle = u_\triangle$, and $v = (v_I, v_\Pi, v_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Omega')$ such that $v_\Pi = 0$ and $v_\triangle = u_\triangle$.

Lemma 4 *For any $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ it holds that*

$$\parallel P_\triangle u_\triangle \parallel^2_{S'_\triangle} \leq C(1 + \log \frac{H}{h})^2 \parallel u_\triangle \parallel^2_{\tilde{S}} \tag{61}$$

where C is a positive constant independent of h and H, $u_\triangle$ and the jumps of ρ_i.

The proof of this lemma is presented in the second part of next section.

5 Refinement and Interpolations

In this section we introduce some technical tools to analyze the FETI-DP precondtioner.

Definition 3 (The triangulation $\underline{\mathcal{T}}^i_h(\Omega_i)$) Let us introduce the triangulation $\underline{\mathcal{T}}^i_h$, which is a refinement of $\mathcal{T}^i_h(\Omega_i)$ as follows. We refine an element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^i_h(\Omega_i)$ by considering four cases:

- No edge of τ belongs to $\partial\Omega_i$: Let V_1, V_2 and V_3 be the vertices of τ and let us denote $(\lambda_1(x), \lambda_2(x), \lambda_3(x))$ as the barycenter coordinates of a point $x \in \bar{\tau}$ such that $V_1 = (1,0,0)$, $V_2 = (0,1,0)$ and $V_3 = (0,0,1)$. Let $M_1 = (0, 1/2, 1/2)$, $M_2 = (1/2, 0, 1/2)$, $M_3 = (1/2, 1/2, 0)$ and $C_1 = (2/3, 1/6, 1/6)$, $C_2 = (1/6, 2/3, 1/6)$, $C_3 = (1/6, 1/6, 2/3)$. The refinement of τ is defined by the triangles $C_1C_2C_3$, $V_1M_3C_1$, $M_3C_2C_1$, $M_3V_2C_2$, $V_2M_1C_2$, $M_1V_3C_2$, $M_1V_3C_3$, $V_3M_2C_3$, $M_2C_1C_3$ and $M_2V_1C_1$. See Figure 4, upper-left picture.

- Only one edge of τ belongs to $\partial\Omega_i$: Let V_1, V_2 and V_3 be the vertices of τ and let us assume that the edge opposed to V_1 belongs to $\partial\Omega_i$. Put $V_1 = (1,0,0)$, $V_2 = (0,1,0)$, $V_3 = (0,0,1)$ and let $M_2 = (1/2,0,1/2)$, $M_3 = (1/2,1/2,0)$, $C_1 = (1/3,1/3,1/3)$, $C_2 = (0,2/3,1/3)$ and $C_3 = (0,1/3,2/3)$. The refinement of τ is defined by the triangles $V_1M_3C_1$, $M_3V_2C_1$, $V_2C_2C_1$, $C_2C_3C_1$, $C_3V_3C_1$, $V_3M_2C_1$ and $M_2V_1C_1$. See Figure 4, upper-right picture.
- Exactly two edges of τ belong to $\partial\Omega_i$: Let C_1, V_2 and V_3 be the vertices of τ and let us assume the edges opposed to V_2 and V_3 belong to $\partial\Omega_i$. We have $C_1 = (1,0,0)$, $V_2 = (0,1,0)$, $V_3 = (0,0,1)$, and define $M_1 = (0,1/2,1/2)$ and $C_2 = (1/2,0,1/2)$, $C_3 = (1/2,1/2,0)$. The refinement of τ is defined by the triangles $C_1C_3C_2$, $C_3V_2M_1$, $M_1C_3C_2$ and $M_1V_3C_3$. See Figure 4, lower-left picture.
- All three edges of τ belong to $\partial\Omega_i$: No refinement is needed, let C_1, C_2 and C_3 be the vertices of τ.

We distinguish the above nodes by saying that they are nodes of type C, type M and type V, respectively. It is easy to see that $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$, the refinement of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$, is a geometrically conforming, shape regular and quasi-uniform triangulation of Ω_i. Therefore, we denote by $\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i)$ as the space of piecewise linear and continuous functions on $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$.

Definition 4 (The space $\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$) Let $\underline{W}_i(\bar{E}_{ji})$ be the space $\underline{W}_j(\Omega_j)$ restricted to $\bar{E}_{ji}$, for $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$. We define $\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ by

$$\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i') = \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i) \times \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}} \underline{W}_i(\bar{E}_{ji}). \tag{62}$$

A function $\underline{u}_i \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ is represented by

$$\underline{u}_i = \{(\underline{u}_i)_i, \{(\underline{u}_i)_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\},$$

where $(\underline{u}_i)_i := \underline{u}_{i\,|\overline{\Omega}_i}$ ($\underline{u}_i$ restricted to $\overline{\Omega}_i$) and $(\underline{u}_i)_j := \underline{u}_{i\,|\bar{E}_{ji}}$ ($\underline{u}_i$ restricted to $\bar{E}_{ji}$). Note that $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ and $(\underline{u}_i)_j$ are continuous on $\overline{\Omega}_i$ and $\bar{E}_{ji}$, repectively.

Definition 5 (The interpolators $\underline{I}_h^i$) Given $u_i = \{(u_i)_i, \{(u_i)_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\} \in W_i(\Omega_i')$, we construct

$$\{(\underline{u}_i)_i, \{(\underline{u}_i)_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\} = \underline{I}_h^i u_i \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i') \quad \text{as follows:}$$

- Define $(\underline{u}_i)_i \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i)$ by assingning values at the nodes of type $C, M, V \in \underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i(\overline{\Omega}_i)$:
  - Nodes of type C: define $(\underline{u}_i)_i(C) = (u_i)_i(C)$.
  - Nodes of type M (with M shared by $\tau_-, \tau_+ \in \mathcal{T}_h^i(\Omega_i)$: define $(\underline{u}_i)_i(M) = 1/2(u_{\tau_+}(M) + u_{\tau_-}(M))$.
  - Nodes of type $V \notin \partial\Omega_i$ (with V shared by the elements $\tau_1, \cdots, \tau_p \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$): define $(\underline{u}_i)_i(V) = 1/p\,(u_{\tau_1}(V) + \cdots + u_{\tau_p}(V))$.



Fig. 4 Illustration of refinement of an element according to its relative position with respect to $\partial\Omega_i$.

  - Nodes of type $V \in \partial\Omega_i$ (with V shared by two element edges $e_r, e_\ell \subset \partial\Omega_i$): define $(\underline{u}_i)_i(V) = 1/2\ (u_{\tau_r}(V) + u_{\tau_\ell}(V))$, where the elements τ_r and τ_ℓ share the edges e_r and e_ℓ, respectively.
- For $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ define $(\underline{u}_i)_j \in \underline{W}_i(\overline{E}_{ji})$ by assingning nodal values at the nodes of type C, V on $\underline{T}_h^j(\bar{E}_{ji})$:
  - Nodes of type C define $(\underline{u}_i)_j(C) = (u_i)_j(C)$
  - Nodes of type V define $(\underline{u}_i)_j(V)$ according to
    - If $V \in \partial\bar{E}_{ji}$, define $(\underline{u}_i)_j(V) = \lim_{(x\in E_{ji})\to V}(u_i)_j(x)$.
    - If $V \notin \partial\bar{E}_{ji}$, define $(\underline{u}_i)_j(V) = 1/2\ (u_{e_r}(V) + u_{e_\ell}(V))$, where e_r and e_ℓ are the two edges of $\mathcal{E}_h^{j,i}$ sharing V.

Note that from the definition of $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$, the value of $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ on $\partial\Omega_i$ depends only on the value of $(u_i)_i$ on $\partial\Omega_i$. In addition, the values of $(u_i)_j$ depends only on the value of $(u_i)_j$ on E_{ji} for any $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$. We note however that the value of $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ on an edge E_{ij} does not necessary depend only on the values of $(u_i)_i$ on E_{ij} due to the way that the nodal values at the subdomain corners are assigned.

For a fixed edge $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^i$, we next modify $\underline{I}_h^i$ (denoted by $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$) so that $\underline{u}_i := \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$ on E_{ij} depends only on the value of $(u_i)_i$ on E_{ij}. We note however that $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ on E_{ik}, for $k \in \mathcal{J}_H^i$ and $k \neq j$, does not depend on the values of $(u_i)_i$ on E_{ik}. The other properties described above for $\underline{I}_h^i$ also holds for $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$. We note that in the case of Figure 4, lower-left picture, the operator $\underline{I}_h^i$ would be enough in order to perform the analysis of the FETI-DP method. The operator $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$ is needed only in cases where two or more elements touch simultaneouly a corner of Γ_i.

Definition 6 (The interpolator $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$) We introduce the interpolator $\underline{I}_h^{i,j} : W_i(\Omega_i') \to \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$, by modifying $\underline{I}_h^i$ only for the definition of $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ at the two endpoints of ∂E_{ij}. For V an endpoint of ∂E_{ij} define $(\underline{u}_i)_i(V) = \lim_{(x \in E_{ij}) \to V} (u_i)_i(x)$.

Let us define the following bilinear forms for the space $\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$

$$\underline{a}_i'(\underline{u}_i, \underline{v}_i) = \underline{a}_i(\underline{u}_i, \underline{v}_i) + s_{i,\partial}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{v}_i) + p_{i,\partial}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{v}_i) \tag{63}$$

and the semi-norm

$$\underline{d}_i(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) = \underline{a}_i(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) + p_{i,\partial}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i)$$

where

$$\underline{a}_i(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) := \int_{\Omega_i} \rho_i \nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i \cdot \nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i \, dx.$$

The following lemma holds. From here on, in order to avoid the proliferation of constants, we use the notation $A \preceq B$ to express the fact that there is a constant C independent of h such that $A \leq CA$. Similarly for the symbol $A \asymp B$ which means that $A \preceq B$ and also $B \preceq A$.

Lemma 5 *For $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ and let $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$ or $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$. Then*

$$\underline{a}_i((\underline{u}_i)_i, (\underline{u}_i)_i) \asymp a_i((u_i)_i, (u_i)_i), \tag{64}$$

and

$$p_{\partial,i}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) \preceq p_{\partial,i}(u_i, u_i)) + a_i((u_i)_i, (u_i)_i), \tag{65}$$

$$p_{\partial,i}(u_i, u_i) \preceq p_{\partial,i}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) + \underline{a}_i((\underline{u}_i)_i, (\underline{u}_i)_i). \tag{66}$$

Additionally, if $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$, then

$$\|(u_i)_i - (u_i)_j\|_{L^2(E_{ij})} \asymp \|(\underline{u}_i)_i - (\underline{u}_i)_j\|_{L^2(E_{ij})}. \tag{67}$$

The proof of this and next lemma are presented in the Appendix.

Definition 7 [The interpolator I_h^i] We now introduce the interpolator $I_h^i : \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i') \to W_i(\Omega_i')$ as follows. Given $\underline{u}_i = \{(\underline{u}_i)_i, \{(\underline{u}_i)_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\} \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ we construct

$$\{(u_i)_i, \{(u_i)_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}}\} := I_h^i \underline{u}_i \in W_i(\Omega_i') \quad \text{as follows:}$$

- For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, let C_1, C_2, C_3 be the nodes of type C in $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$ on $\bar{\tau}$. We define $(u_i)_i$ on τ as the linear extrapolation on τ of the linear function defined by the nodal values $(\underline{u}_i)_i(C_1), (\underline{u}_i)_i(C_2)$ and $(\underline{u}_i)_i(C_3)$.
- For $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{j,i}$, let $C_1$and C_2 be the nodes of type C on element edge e. We define $(u_i)_j$ on element edge e as the linear extrapolation on e of the linear function defined by the nodal values $(\underline{u}_i)_j(C_1)$ and $(\underline{u}_i)_j(C_2)$.

The following lemma holds.

Lemma 6 *Let $\underline{u}_i \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$. Then*

$$a_i(I_h^i \underline{u}_i, I_h^i \underline{u}_i) \preceq \underline{a}_i(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i) \tag{68}$$

and

$$p_{i,\partial}(I_h^i \underline{u}_i, I_h^i \underline{u}_i) \preceq p_{i,\partial}(\underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_i). \tag{69}$$

In case $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$ or $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$, we have then

$$I_h^i \underline{u}_i = u_i. \tag{70}$$

Let us also introduce $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'} \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ as the standard discrete harmonic function of $\underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'} \in \underline{W}_i(\Gamma_i')$, i.e., $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'} = \underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'}$ on Γ_i' and discrete harmonic in Ω_i in the sense of $\underline{a}_i(\cdot,\cdot)$, see (63), with Dirichlet data on Γ_i. We note that the extensions $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i$ and $\mathcal{H}_i'$ differ from each other not only because they are defined in different space $\underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ and $W_i(\Omega_i')$, respectively, but also because $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'}$ at the interior nodes of $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$ depends only on the nodal values of $\underline{u}_{i,\Gamma'}$ on Γ_i, while $\mathcal{H}_i' u_{i,\Gamma'}$ depends on the nodal values of $u_{i,\Gamma'}$ on Γ_i'.

The following lemma shows the equivalence (in the energy form defined by $d_i(\cdot,\cdot)$) between discrete harmonic functions in the sense of $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i$ and in the sense of $\mathcal{H}_i'$; for the proof see [7]. This equivalence allows us to take advantages of all the discrete Sobolev results known for $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i$ discrete harmonic extensions.

Lemma 7 *Let $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ and $\underline{u}_i \in \underline{W}_i(\Omega_i')$ defined by $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$ or by $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$. Then*

$$\underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i) \asymp d_i(\mathcal{H}_i' u_i, \mathcal{H}_i' u_i) \tag{71}$$

where C is a positive constant independent of δ, h_i, H_i, ρ_i and u_i.

Proof First note by construction that $I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{I}_h^i u_i = I_h^i \underline{I}_h^i u_i = u_i$ on Γ_i'. Using Lemma 1, a minimum $\mathcal{H}_i'$-energy argument and Lemma 1 again, we obtain

$$d_i(\mathcal{H}_i' u_i, \mathcal{H}_i' u_i) \asymp a_i'(\mathcal{H}_i' u_i, \mathcal{H}_i' u_i) \leq a_i'(I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i, I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i) \asymp d_i(I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i, I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i).$$

By Lemma 6 we have

$$d_i(I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i, I_h^i \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i) \preceq \underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i \underline{u}_i).$$

The proof of the left inequality of (71) is complete. The proof using the operator $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$ instead of $\underline{I}_h^i$ is similar.

Now let as prove the left inequality of (71). Note that $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i\mathcal{H}_i'u_i = \underline{u}_i$ on Γ_i'. Using a minimal $\mathcal{H}_i'$-energy argument and Lemma 5 we obtain

$$\underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i) \asymp \underline{a}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i) \leq \underline{a}_i(\underline{I}_h^i\mathcal{H}_i'u_i, \underline{I}_h^i\mathcal{H}_i'u_i) \asymp a_i(\mathcal{H}_i'u_i, \mathcal{H}_i'u_i),$$

and again Lemma 5 we have

$$p_{i,\partial}(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i) = p_{i,\partial}(\underline{I}_h^i\mathcal{H}_i'u_i, \underline{I}_h^i\mathcal{H}_i'u_i) \preceq d_i(\mathcal{H}_i'u_i, \mathcal{H}_i'u_i),$$

therefore, the left inequality of (71) follows. The proof with $\underline{I}_h^{i,j}$ is similar.

We are now in position to prove Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4.

Proof We first consider the case when the edges E_{ij} are made by a single interval only. Let $u_\triangle \in W_\triangle(\Gamma')$ and let $u = (u_\Pi, u_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ be the solution of

$$\langle \tilde{S}u_\triangle, u_\triangle\rangle \;=\; \min\langle S'w, w\rangle =: \langle S'u, u\rangle, \tag{72}$$

where the minimum is taken over $w = (w_\Pi, w_\triangle) \in \tilde{W}(\Gamma')$ such that $w_\Pi \in \hat{W}_\Pi(\Gamma')$ and $w_\triangle = u_\triangle$. Here $S' = \mathrm{diag}\{S_i'\}_{i=1}^N$ where S_i' is defined in (19). The problem has a unique solution, see (60). Hence, we can replace $\|u_\triangle\|_{\tilde{S}}$ in (61) by $\|u\|_{S'}$.

Let us represent the u defined above as $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \in W(\Gamma')$ where $u_i \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$. Let $I_{E_{ij}}(u_i)_i$ be the linear function on $\bar{E}_{ij}$ defined by the values of $(u_i)_i$ at $x \in \partial E_{ij}$, and let $I_{E_{ji}}(u_i)_j$ be the linear function on $\bar{E}_{ji}$ defined by the values of $(u_i)_j$ at $x \in \partial E_{ji}$. Let $\hat{u} := \{\hat{u}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ where $\hat{u}_i \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$ is defined by

$$(\hat{u}_i)_i = I_{E_{ij}}(u_i)_i \;\text{ on }\; \bar{E}_{ijh} \;\text{ for all }\; j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$$

and

$$(\hat{u}_i)_j = I_{E_{ji}}(u_i)_j \;\text{ on }\; \bar{E}_{jih} \;\text{ for all }\; j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}.$$

Note that $\hat{u} \in \hat{W}(\Gamma')$, therefore, let us represent $\hat{u} = (\hat{u}_\Pi, \hat{u}_\triangle)$ where $B_\triangle\hat{u}_\triangle = 0$. Using this we have, see (51),

$$P_\triangle u_\triangle \equiv B_{D,\triangle}^T B_\triangle u_\triangle = B_{D,\triangle}^T B_\triangle(u_\triangle - \hat{u}_\triangle) = P_\triangle(u_\triangle - \hat{u}_\triangle).$$

Note that $u - \hat{u} = 0$ at the Π-nodes, hence, let us define $v \in W(\Gamma')$ to be equal to $P_\triangle(u_\triangle - \hat{u}_\triangle)$ at the $\triangle$-nodes and equal to zero at the Π-nodes. Let us represent $v = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$ where $v_i \in W_i(\Gamma_i')$. We have

$$\| P_\triangle u_\triangle \|_{S'_\Delta}^2 = \| v \|_{S'}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \| v_i \|_{S_i'}^2 \tag{73}$$

in view of the definition of $S'_{i,\triangle}$, S'_{Δ} and S', see (48), (19) and (36), hence, to prove the lemma it remains to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \| v_i \|^2_{S'_i} \leq C(1+\log H/h)^2 \|u\|^2_{S'} \tag{74}$$

since by (72) we obtain (61). By Lemma 1 we need to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i(\mathcal{H}'v_i, \mathcal{H}'v_i) \leq C(1+\log H/h)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i(\mathcal{H}'u_i, \mathcal{H}'u_i). \tag{75}$$

Define $\underline{v}_i = \underline{I}^i_h v_i$. Note that because v_i vanishes at the Π- nodes, $\underline{v}_i$ also vanishes at the Π-nodes. Using Lemma 7 we obtain

$$d_i(\mathcal{H}'v_i, \mathcal{H}'v_i) \asymp \underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{v}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{v}_i).$$

From now on, let us denote $\underline{v}_i = \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{v}_i$ and $\underline{v}_j = \underline{\mathcal{H}}_j\underline{v}_j$ and so,

$$\underline{d}_i(\underline{v}_i, \underline{v}_i) = \rho_i \| \nabla(\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} + \sum_{j\in \mathcal{J}^i_H} \frac{\rho_i\delta}{l_{ij}h_e} \| (\underline{v}_i)_i - (\underline{v}_i)_j \|^2_{L^2(E_{ij})}. \tag{76}$$

We first estimate the first term of (76). We have

$$\| \nabla(\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} \leq C \sum_{j\in \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H} \| (\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} \tag{77}$$

by the well-known estimate, see [20], and the fact that $(\underline{v}_i)_i = 0$ at corners of Γ_i. Note that (77) is also valid for subdomains Ω_i which intersect $\partial\Omega$ by edges since we use the obvious inequality

$$\| \nabla(\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} \leq \| \nabla(\tilde{\underline{v}}_i)_i \|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} \leq C \sum_{j\in \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H} \| (\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})}$$

where $(\tilde{\underline{v}}_i)_i$ is the $\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i$ discrete harmonic extension on Ω_i with $(\tilde{\underline{v}}_i)_i = (\underline{v}_i)_i$ on edges $\bar{E}_{ij}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H$, and $(\tilde{v}_i)_i = 0$ on edges $\bar{E}_{ij}$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}^{i,\partial}_H$. For the case E_{ij} such that $j \in \mathcal{J}^{i,0}_H$, define $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}^{i,j}_h u_i$ and $\underline{u}_j = \underline{I}^{j,i}_h u_j$. Note also that $\underline{\hat{u}}_i = I^{i,j}_h \hat{u}_i = \hat{u}_i$ on $\bar{E}_{ij}$ and $\bar{E}_{ji}$, and also $\underline{\hat{u}}_j = I^{j,i}_h \hat{u}_j = \hat{u}_j$. We use (52) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho_i \| (\underline{v}_i)_i \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} = \frac{\rho_i\rho_j^{2\beta}}{(\rho_i^\beta+\rho_j^\beta)^2} \| (\underline{u}_i - \underline{\hat{u}}_i)_i - (\underline{u}_j - \underline{\hat{u}}_j)_i \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} \leq \\
&\leq 3\,\{\rho_i \| (\underline{u}_i - \underline{\hat{u}}_i)_i \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} + \rho_j \| (\underline{u}_j - \underline{\hat{u}}_j)_j \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ji})} + \\
&+ \frac{\rho_i\rho_j^{2\beta}}{(\rho_i^\beta+\rho_j^\beta)^2} \| (\underline{u}_j - \underline{\hat{u}}_j)_i - (\underline{u}_j - \underline{\hat{u}}_j)_j \|^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} \},
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where we have used that $\frac{\rho_i \rho_j^{2\beta}}{(\rho_i^\beta+\rho_j^\beta)^2} \leq \min\{\rho_i, \rho_j\}$ if $\beta \in [1/2, \infty)$, see [19].

Following the same steps of the proof of Lemma 4.5 in [10] (see there (4.49)-(4.51)), we can bound

$$\rho_i \parallel (\underline{v}_i)_i \parallel^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} \leq C(1+\log\frac{H}{h})^2\{\underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i) + \underline{d}_j(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_j\underline{u}_j, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_j\underline{u}_j)\} \quad (79)$$

and using Lemma 7 we obtain

$$\rho_i \parallel (\underline{v}_i)_i \parallel^2_{H^{1/2}_{00}(E_{ij})} \leq C(1+\log\frac{H}{h})^2\{d_i(\mathcal{H}'_i u_i, \mathcal{H}'_i u_i) + d_j(\mathcal{H}'_j u_j, \mathcal{H}'_j u_j)\}. \quad (80)$$

It remains to estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (76). The case E_{ij} where $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,\partial}$ is trivial. For the case E_{ij} such that $j \in \mathcal{J}_H^{i,0}$ using (52) - (53), and similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 in [10] (see there (4.45)-(4.51)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta\rho_i}{l_{ij}h_e} \parallel (\underline{v}_i)_i - (\underline{v}_i)_j \parallel^2_{L^2(E_{ij})} &= \frac{\rho_i\rho_j^{2\gamma}}{(\rho_i^\gamma+\rho_j^\gamma)^2} \times \\ \leq C(1+\log\frac{H}{h})^2\{\underline{d}_i(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_i\underline{u}_i) &+ \underline{d}_j(\underline{\mathcal{H}}_j\underline{u}_j, \underline{\mathcal{H}}_j\underline{u}_j)\}. \quad (81)\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta\rho_i}{l_{ij}h_e} \parallel (\underline{v}_i)_i - (\underline{v}_i)_j \parallel^2_{L^2(E_{ij})} \leq C(1+\log\frac{H}{h})^2 \times \\ \{d_i(\mathcal{H}'_i u_i, \mathcal{H}'_i u_i) + d_j(\mathcal{H}'_j u_j, \mathcal{H}'_j u_j)\}. \quad (82)\end{aligned}$$

Using the inequalities (80) and (82) in (76), summing the resulting inequality for i from 1 to N and noting that the number of edges of each subdomain can be bounded independently of N, we obtain (75) and (74).

The proof also works with minor modifications for the case when E_{ij} is a continuous curve of intervals. For that, we should consider discrete Sobolev tools for non straight edges, see for instance [15], and interpret $I_{E_{ij}}(u_i)_i$ and $I_{E_{ji}}(u_i)_j$ as the linear function with respect to parametrized path on the edge defined by the nodal value of $(u_i)_i$ or $(u_i)_j$ at $x \in \partial E_{ij}$ and ∂E_{ji}.

6 Numerical experiments

In this section, we present numerical results for solving the linear system (45) with the left preconditioner (57). We show that the lower and upper bounds of Theorem 1 are reflected in the numerical tests. In particular we show that the constant C in (58) does not depend on h_i, H_i, and the jumps of ρ_i.

We consider the domain $\Omega = (0,1)^2$ and divide into $N = M \times M$ squares subdomains Ω_i of size $H = 1/M$. Inside each subdomain Ω_i we generate a structured triangulation with $n = m \times m$ subintervals in each coordinate direction and apply the discretization presented in Section 2.2 with penalty

term $\delta = 10$. In the numerical experiments we use a red and black checkerboard type of subdomain partition, where the most bottom-left subdomain has a black color. We solve the second order elliptic problem $-\text{div}(\rho(x)\nabla u^*_{ex}(x)) = 1$ in Ω with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions $u^* = 0$. In the numerical experiments, we run PCG until the l_2 initial residual is reduced by a factor of 10^{10}.

Table 1 Number of iterations, condition numbers (in parenthesis) for different sizes of coarse and local problems and with constant coefficient $\rho = 1$. Here $\beta = 1$, see (49).

$M \downarrow m \rightarrow$	4	8	16
4	13 (2.28)	13 (2.84)	13 (3.61)
8	15 (2.50)	17 (3.16)	18 (4.01)
16	15 (2.59)	17 (3.28)	20 (4.16)

In the first test of experiments we consider the constant coefficient case $\rho = 1$. We consider different values of $N = M \times M$ coarse partitions and different values of local refinements $n = m \times m$. Table 1 lists the number of PCG iterations and in parenthesis the condition number estimate of the preconditioned system. As expected from the analysis, the condition numbers appear to be independent of the number of subdomains and grow by a two-logarithmically factor when the size of the local problems increases. As expected from the theory, the lower bounds estimates are always very closed to one, therefore, we do not show in the tables.

Table 2 Number of iterations, condition numbers (in parenthesis) for different sizes of coarse and local problems and with constant coefficient $\rho = 1$ in the black substructures and $\rho = 1000$ in the red substructures. Here $\beta = 1$, see (49).

$M \downarrow m \rightarrow$	4	8	16
4	5 (1.10)	5 (1.10)	5 (1.10)
8	6 (1.10)	6 (1.12)	6 (1.16)
16	7 (1.29)	8 (1.42)	8 (1.55)

We now consider the discontinuous coefficients case where we set $\rho_b = 1$ on the black substructures and we vary ρ_r on the red substructures. We first consider different values of $N = M \times M$ coarse partitions and different values of local refinements $n = m \times m$ while we keep $\rho_r = 1000$. The results are shown in Table 2 and are similar to the previous test for continuous coefficient.

For the next experiment the substructures partition is kept fixed to 8×8. Table 3 lists the results on runs for different values of ρ_r and for different levels of refinements. In Table 4 and Table 5 we repeat the test with two diferent values of β, see (49). The performance of the preconditioner is robust with respect to the coefficients and h as predicted.

Table 3 Number of iterations and condition numbers (in parenthesis) for different values of the coefficient ρ_r on the red substructures and local meshes with $n = m \times m$. On black substructures the coefficient $\rho_b = 1$ is kept fixed. The substructure partition is also kept fixed to $N = M \times M = 8 \times 8$. Here $\beta = 1$, see (49).

$\rho_r \downarrow m \rightarrow$	2	4	8	16
10000	5 (1.10)	5 (1.09)	5 (1.09)	5 (1.09)
1000	6 (1.10)	6 (1.10)	6 (1.12)	6 (1.16)
100	7 (1.21)	7 (1.35)	8 (1.50)	9 (1.66)
10	10 (1.50)	11 (1.79)	13 (2.15)	15 (2.55)
1	12 (1.96)	15 (2.50)	17 (3.16)	18 (4.01)
0.1	10 (1.51)	12 (1.82)	13 (2.18)	15 (2.59)
0.01	7 (1.27)	8 (1.44)	9 (1.62)	10 (1.80)
0.001	6 (1.10)	6 (1.14)	6 (1.21)	6 (1.28)
0.0001	5 (1.10)	5 (1.09)	5 (1.09)	5 (1.09)

Table 4 Number of iterations and condition numbers (in parenthesis) for different values of the coefficient ρ_r and local meshes with $n = m \times m$ on the red substructures. On black substructures the coefficient $\rho_b = 1$ is kept fixed. The substructure partition is also kept fixed to $N = M \times M = 8 \times 8$. Here $\beta = 0.5$, see (49).

$\rho_r \downarrow m \rightarrow$	2	4	8	16
1000	20 (4.21)	24 (5.37)	25 (6.58)	28 (9.68)
1	12 (1.96)	15 (2.50)	17 (3.16)	18 (4.01)
0.001	20 (4.21)	24 (5.39)	25 (6.55)	27 (9.54)

Table 5 Number of iterations and condition numbers (in parenthesis) for different values of the coefficient ρ_r and local meshes with $n = m \times m$ on the red substructures. On black substructures the coefficient $\rho_b = 1$ is kept fixed. The substructure partition is also kept fixed to $N = M \times M = 8 \times 8$. Here $\beta = 10$, see (49).

$\rho_r \downarrow m \rightarrow$	2	4	8	16
1000	6 (1.10)	6 (1.10)	6 (1.12)	6 (1.16)
1	12 (1.96)	15 (2.50)	17 (3.16)	18 (4.01)
0.001	6 (1.10)	6 (1.14)	6 (1.21)	6 (1.29)

A Proof of Lemma 5

We first prove the right hand side of the first inequality, the inequality (64). That is, we prove that there exist a constant C such that, for all $u_i \in W_i(\Omega_i')$ we have

$$\underline{a}_i((\underline{u}_i)_i, (\underline{u}_i)_i) \leq C a_i(u_i, u_i). \tag{83}$$

First, note that,

$$\underline{a}_i((\underline{u}_i)_i, (\underline{u}_i)_i) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \rho_i \int_\tau |\nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i|^2 dx. \tag{84}$$

We consider the cases of refined mesh $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$ listed in Definition 3 and illustrated in Figure 4.

First case (Figure 4, upper-left picture). For the first case, that is, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ and let us denote this triangle by τ_ℓ and its neighbor by τ_p, see Figure 5.

Let us denote by $\underline{\tau}$ a generic triangle of $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_h^i$. We have

$$\int_{\tau_\ell} |\nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i|^2 dx = \sum_{\underline{\tau} \subset \tau_\ell} \int_{\underline{\tau}} |\nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i|^2 dx.$$



Fig. 5 Illustration of refinement of two neighboring elements.

The sum runs over ten triangles listed in the first case of Definition 3. Let $(u_i)_i$ and $(\underline{u}_i)_i$ on τ be denoted by $u_i^{(\ell)}$ or $u^{(\ell)}$ and $\underline{u}_i^{(\ell)}$ or $\underline{u}^{(\ell)}$, respectively. Note that in the triangle $\Delta^{(\ell)} := C_1^{(\ell)}C_2^{(\ell)}C_3^{(\ell)} \subset \tau_\ell$ we have $(u_i)_i|_{\tau_\ell} = (u_i^\ell) = u^{(\ell)}$ and then

$$\int_{\Delta^{(\ell)}} |\nabla \underline{u}_i^{(\ell)}|^2 dx = \int_{\Delta^{(\ell)}} |\nabla u_i^{(\ell)}|^2 dx = \int_{\Delta^{(\ell)}} |\nabla u^{(\ell)}|^2 dx.$$

Let us consider now the triangle $\Delta^{(\ell)} := C_2^{(\ell)}C_3^{(\ell)}M_1^{(\ell)}$ where $M_1^{(\ell)} = M_1^{(p)}$. We have (see Figure 5)

$$\begin{aligned} I := & \int_{\Delta^{(\ell)}} |(\nabla(u_i^{(\ell)}))_i|^2 dx \le C\Big\{ \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_3^{(\ell)}) - u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)})\Big]^2 + \\ & \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_3^{(\ell)}) - 0.5\Big(u^{(\ell)}(M_1^{(\ell)}) + u^{(p)}(M_1^{(p)})\Big)\Big]^2 + \\ & \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)}) - 0.5\Big(u^{(\ell)}(M_1^{(\ell)}) + u^{(p)}(M_1^{(p)})\Big)\Big]^2 \\ & := I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

The first term above, I_1, it is estimated by $\|\nabla u^{(\ell)}\|^2_{L^2(\Delta^{(\ell)})}$. The second term, I_2, it is estimated as follows. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\le C\Big\{ \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_3^{(\ell)}) - u^{(\ell)}(M_1^{(\ell)})\Big]^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Big[u^{(\ell)}(M_1^{(\ell)}) - u^{(p)}(M_1^{(p)})\Big]^2 \\ &\le C\Big\{ \|\nabla u^{(\ell)}\|^2_{L^2(\Delta^{(\ell)})} + \frac{1}{h}\|u^{(\ell)} - u^{(p)}\|^2_{L^2(V_2^{(\ell)}V_3^{(\ell)})} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where here $V_2^{(\ell)}V_3^{(\ell)}$ denotes the edge of τ with the end points $V_2^{(\ell)}$ and $V_3^{(\ell)}$. In the same way we can estimate the third term, I_3. Thus,

$$I \le C\left\{ \|\nabla u^{(\ell)}\|^2_{L^2(\tau_\ell)} + \frac{1}{h}\|u^{(\ell)} - u^{(p)}\|^2_{L^2(V_1^{(\ell)}V_3^{(\ell)})} \right\}. \tag{86}$$

Similarly it is possible to estimate the terms involving the triangles $C_1^{(\ell)}C_2^{(\ell)}M_3^{(\ell)}$ and $C_1^{(\ell)}C_3^{(\ell)}M_2^{(\ell)}$.

We now estimate the term on $\Delta^\ell := C_2^{(\ell)} M_3^{(\ell)} V_2^{(\ell)}$. We have then

$$
\begin{aligned}
I := & \int_{\Delta^{(\ell)}} |\nabla \underline{u}_i^{(\ell)}|^2 dx \le C \Big\{ \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)}) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(u^{(\ell)}(M_3^{(\ell)}) + u^{(k)}(M_2^{(k)}) \Big) \Big]^2 + \\
& \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)}) - \frac{1}{n_{\ell pk}} \Big(u^{(\ell)}(V_2^{(\ell)}) + u^{(p)}(V_3^{(\ell)}) + \cdots + u^{(k)}(V_2^{(k)}) \Big) \Big]^2 + \\
& \Big[\frac{1}{2}\Big(u^{(\ell)}(M_3^{(\ell)}) + u^{(k)}(M_2^{(k)}) \Big) - \\
& \frac{1}{n_{\ell pk}} \Big(u^{(\ell)}(V_2^{(\ell)}) + u^{(p)}(V_3^{(\ell)}) + \cdots + u^{(k)}(V_2^{(k)}) \Big) \Big) \Big]^2 \\
& := I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \qquad (87)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here τ_k has a common edge $V_1^{(\ell)} V_2^{(\ell)}$ with τ_ℓ and $n_{\ell pk}$ is the number of triangles of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ with common vertex $V_2^{(\ell)}$. The first term, I_1, and then second term, I_2 are estimated as in (85). The third term, I_3, it is estimated in a similar way by adding and substracting the quantity $\Big(u^{(\ell)}(V_2^{(\ell)}) + u^{(k)}(V_2^{(k)}) \Big)$, see Figure 5. We proceed as above and using these estimates in (87) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
I \le C \Big\{ & \|\nabla u^{(\ell)}\|^2_{L^2(\tau_\ell)} + \|\nabla u^{(k)}\|^2_{L^2(\tau_k)} + \\
& \frac{1}{h} \Big\{ \|u^{(\ell)} - u^{(k)}\|^2_{L^2(\partial\tau_\ell \cap \partial\tau_k)} + \cdots + \|u^{(\ell)} - u^{(p)}\|^2_{L^2(\partial\tau_\ell \cap \partial\tau_p)} \Big\} \Big\}. \qquad (88)
\end{aligned}
$$

In a similar way are estimated the terms over the remaining triangles of τ_ℓ.

Using the above estimates we show that

$$
\int_{\tau_\ell} |\nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i|^2 \le C \Big\{ \sum_{\tau} \|\nabla(u_i)_i\|^2_{L^2(\tau)} + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{e} \|(u_i)_i^+ - (u_i)_i^-\|^2_{L^2(e)} \Big\} \qquad (89)
$$

where the first sum runs over the elements τ which intersect τ_ℓ by an edge and the second sum runs over edges e of τ which have a common vertex or edge with τ_ℓ.

Second case (Figure 4, upper-right picture). We now consider the case when a vertex of Ω_i is common for two and more triangles of $\mathcal{T}_i^h$. Let us consider the case of two triangles, see Figure 6. This case is estimated similar as the first case.

Third case (Figure 4, lower-left picture). This case (see Figure 7) is also estimated similar as the first case.

Adding the above estimates for the three cases we get the estimate (83) for the case $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$. For the case $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$ we need only some minor modifications of the proof of the second case above, see Figure 6. This finishes the proof of the left hand side inequality of (64).

We now present the proof of the left hand side of the result stated in Lemma 5, Equation (64). We need to show that there exists a constant C such that

$$
a_i((u_i)_i, (u_i)_i) \le C \underline{a}_i((\underline{u}_i)_i, (\underline{u}_i)_i). \qquad (90)
$$

Note that, on $\tau_\ell \in \mathcal{T}_i^h$ with vertices of type C, we have (see Figure 5)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla(u_i)_i\|^2_{L^2(\tau_\ell)} \le & C \Big\{ \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_1^{(\ell)}) - u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)}) \Big]^2 + \\
& \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_1^{(\ell)}) - u^{(\ell)}(C_3^{(\ell)}) \Big]^2 + \Big[u^{(\ell)}(C_2^{(\ell)}) - u^{(\ell)}(C_3^{(\ell)}) \Big]^2 \Big\} \\
\le & C \|\nabla(I_h^{(i)} u^{(\ell)})\|^2_{L^2(\tau_\ell)} \le C \|\nabla(\underline{u}_i)_i\|^2_{L^2(\tau_\ell)}. \qquad (91)
\end{aligned}
$$



Fig. 6 Illustration of refinement of two neighboring elements.



Fig. 7 Illustration of refinement of two neighboring elements.

This is valid for all three cases considered above. Using the estimate (91) we prove (90). The proof of the equivalence (64) is now complete.

We now prove the second inequality of Lemma 5, the inequality (65). We have

$$p_{i,\partial}(\underline{u}_i,\underline{u}_i)=\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_H^i}\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^{i,j}}\int_e\frac{\delta}{\ell_{ij}}\frac{\rho_i}{h_e}(\underline{u}_i-\underline{u}_j)^2dS. \tag{92}$$

On the edge e we have (see Figure 8))

$$\int_e(\underline{u}_i-\underline{u}_j)dS=\sum_{\underline{e}\subset e}\int_{\underline{e}}(\underline{u}_i-\underline{u}_j)^2dS \tag{93}$$

where $\underline{e}$ runs over the edges of $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_i^h$, $\underline{e} \subset E_{ij}$. Note that, on $\underline{e} = [C_2^+, C_3^+] = [C_2^-, C_3^-]$, we can write

$$\int_{\underline{e}} (\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j)^2 dS = \int_{\underline{e}} (u_i - u_j)^2 dS.$$

Additionally, on $\underline{e} = [V_1^+, C_2^+] = [V_1^-, C_2^-]$, we have

$$\int_{\underline{e}} (\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j)^2 dS \le C\Big\{ \Big[u_i(C_2^+) - u_j(C_2^-)\Big]^2 + \Big[\frac{1}{2}(u_i(C_2^+) - u_j(\widetilde{C}_2^+)) - \frac{1}{2}(u_j(C_2^-) - u_j(\widetilde{C}_2^-))\Big]^2 \Big\}$$

where $\widetilde{C}_2^+$ and $\widetilde{C}_2^-$ are the nodal points on edges $\widetilde{e}$ of the triangles of $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^j$ on E_{ij} and E_{ji} with common nodal points V_1^+ and V_1^-, respectively. Thus, in this case,

$$\int_{\underline{e}} (\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j)^2 dS \le C\Big\{ \|u_i - u_j\|^2_{L^2(e)} + \|u_i - u_j\|^2_{L^2(\tilde{e})} \Big\}$$

where $\tilde{e} \cap e = V_1^+ = V_1^-$. In the case when V_1^+ or V_2^+ are corners of $\partial\Omega_i$ we do the same modification which give $\|\nabla u_i\|^2_{L^2(\tau)}$ on τ with vertices V_1^+ or V_2^+. Using these in (93) and the resulting estimate into (92) we get an estimate of the second inequality of Lemma 5 for the case when $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^i u_i$. The case when $\underline{u}_i = I_h^{i,j} u_i$ is proved similarly.

Now we prove the third inequality of Lemma 5, the inequality (66). We have that (93) still holds if we replace $\underline{u}_i$ by $\underline{u}_j$ and u_i by u_j, respectively. Note that (see Figure 8)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_e (u_i - u_j)^2 dS &\le C\Big\{ \Big[u_i(C_1^+) - u_j(C_1^-)]^2 + \Big[u_i(C_2^+) - u_j(C_2^-)]^2 \Big\} \\ &\le C \int_{\widetilde{e}} (\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j)^2 dx\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{e} = (C_1^+, C_2^+)$. Using these estimates we see that the third inequality is valid for $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_i u_i$. The case $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$ is similar.

It remains only to estimate the fourth inequality, inequality (67). It is proved as in the third inequality for $\underline{u}_i = \underline{I}_h^{i,j} u_i$.

The proof of Lemma 5 is complete.

B Proof of Lemma 6

For the first inequality, (68), note that on $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ (see Figure 4 upper-left picture)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\tau |\nabla(I_h^i \underline{u}_i)|^2 dS &\le C\Big\{ \Big[\underline{u}_i(C_1) - \underline{u}_i(C_2)\Big]^2 + \Big[\underline{u}_i(C_1) - \underline{u}_i(C_3)\Big]^2 + \Big[\underline{u}_i(C_2) - \underline{u}_i(C_3)\Big]^2 \\ &\le C\|\nabla \underline{u}_i\|^2_{L^2(C_1C_2C_3)} \le C\|\nabla \underline{u}_i\|^2_{L^2(\tau)}.\end{aligned}$$

Summing this for $\tau \subset \overline{\Omega}_i$ we get the first inequality.

To prove the second inequality, (69), note that on $e \subset \partial\Omega_i$ (see Figure 8)

$$\begin{aligned}\|I_h^i \underline{u}_i - I_h^i \underline{u}_j\|^2_{L^2(e)} &\le C\Big\{ \Big[\underline{u}_i(C_2^+) - \underline{u}_j(C_2^-)\Big]^2 + \Big[\underline{u}_i(C_3^+) - \underline{u}_j(C_3^-)\Big]^2 \Big\} \\ &\le C\frac{1}{h}\|\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j\|^2_{L^2(\underline{e})} \quad (\text{ with } \underline{e} = (C_2^+, C_3^+)) \\ &\le C\frac{1}{h}\|\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_j\|^2_{L^2(e)}.\end{aligned}$$

Summing this estimate over $e \subset \partial\Omega_i$ we get the second inequality.



Fig. 8 Illustration of common edge refinement.

The equality $I_h^i \underline{u}_i = u_i$ follows from the definitions of I_h^i and $\underline{u}_i$.
The proof of Lemma 6 is now complete.

References

1. D. N. Arnold, *An interior penalty finite element method with discontinuous elements*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 19 (1982), pp. 742–760.
2. D. N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, B. Cockburn, and L. D. Marini, *Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 39 (2001/02), pp. 1749–1779 (electronic).
3. Z. Cai, X. Ye, and S. Zhang, *Discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for interface problems: a priori and a posteriori error estimations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 49 (2011), pp. 1761–1787.
4. L. C. Cowsar, J. Mandel, and M. F. Wheeler, *Balancing domain decomposition for mixed finite elements*, Math. Comp., 64 (1995), pp. 989–1015.
5. L. T. Diosady and D. L. Darmofal, *A unified analysis of balancing domain decomposition by constraints for discontinuous Galerkin discretizations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 50 (2012), pp. 1695–1712.
6. M. Dryja, *On discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems with discontinuous coefficients*, Comput. Methods Appl. Math., 3 (2003), pp. 76–85 (electronic).
7. M. Dryja, J. Galvis, and M. Sarkis, *BDDC methods for discontinuous Galerkin discretization of elliptic problems*, J. Complexity, 23 (2007), pp. 715–739.
8. ———, *Balancing domain decomposition methods for discontinuous Galerkin discretization*, in Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XVII, vol. 60 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 271–278.
9. ———, *Neumann-Neumann methods for a DG discretization on geometrically nonconforming substructures*, Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations, 28 (2012), pp. 1194–1226.
10. ———, *A FETI-DP preconditioner for a composite finite element and discontinuous Galerkin method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 51 (2013), pp. 400–422.
11. M. Dryja and M. Sarkis, *3-D FETI-DP preconditioners for composite finite element-discontinuous galerkin methods*, in Domain Decomposition Methods in Science and Engineering XXII, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., Springer, Berlin, 2013, p. To appear.
12. C. Farhat, M. Lesoinne, P. LeTallec, K. Pierson, and D. Rixen, *FETI-DP: a dual-primal unified FETI method. I. A faster alternative to the two-level FETI method*, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 50 (2001), pp. 1523–1544.

13. C. Farhat, M. Lesoinne, and K. Pierson, *A scalable dual-primal domain decomposition method*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl., 7 (2000), pp. 687–714. Preconditioning techniques for large sparse matrix problems in industrial applications (Minneapolis, MN, 1999).
14. J. S. Hesthaven and T. Warburton, *Nodal discontinuous Galerkin methods*, vol. 54 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2008. Algorithms, analysis, and applications.
15. A. Klawonn, O. Rheinbach, and O. B. Widlund, *An analysis of a FETI-DP algorithm on irregular subdomains in the plane*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 46 (2008), pp. 2484–2504.
16. A. Klawonn, O. B. Widlund, and M. Dryja, *Dual-primal FETI methods for three-dimensional elliptic problems with heterogeneous coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 40 (2002), pp. 159–179 (electronic).
17. J. Mandel and R. Tezaur, *On the convergence of a dual-primal substructuring method*, Numer. Math., 88 (2001), pp. 543–558.
18. B. Rivière, *Discontinuous Galerkin methods for solving elliptic and parabolic equations: Theory and implementations*, vol. 35 of Frontiers in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
19. M. Sarkis, *Nonstandard coarse spaces and Schwarz methods for elliptic problems with discontinuous coefficients using non-conforming elements*, Numer. Math., 77 (1997), pp. 383–406.
20. A. Toselli and O. Widlund, *Domain decomposition methods—algorithms and theory*, vol. 34 of Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.